

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DENNIS BRATTON,

Petitioner,

v.

CHRISTIAN PFEIFFER,

Respondent.

No. 1:23-cv-01748-KES-SAB (HC)

ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS, DISMISSING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS
CORPUS, DIRECTING CLERK OF COURT
TO CLOSE CASE, AND DECLINING TO
ISSUE CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

(Docs. 6, 11, 13)

Petitioner Dennis Bratton is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.

On July 30, 2024,¹ the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and recommendations recommending that the petition be dismissed as untimely. Doc. 13. The findings and recommendations were served on the parties and contained notice that any objections were to be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of service of the findings and recommendations. *Id.* To date, no objections have been filed, and the time for doing so has passed.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has conducted a de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court holds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and proper analysis.

¹ The findings and recommendations were signed on July 29, 2024, but not docketed until July 30, 2024.

1 Having found that petitioner is not entitled to habeas relief, the Court now turns to
 2 whether a certificate of appealability should issue. A petitioner seeking a writ of habeas corpus
 3 has no absolute entitlement to appeal a district court's denial of his petition, and an appeal is
 4 allowed only in certain circumstances. *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 335-36 (2003); 28
 5 U.S.C. § 2253. Where, as here, the Court denies habeas relief on procedural grounds without
 6 reaching the underlying constitutional claims, the court should issue a certificate of appealability
 7 "if jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial
 8 of a constitutional right and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court
 9 was correct in its procedural ruling." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). "Where a
 10 plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a
 11 reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or
 12 that the petitioner should be allowed to proceed further." *Id.*

13 In the present case, the Court finds that reasonable jurists would not find the Court's
 14 determination that the petition should be dismissed debatable or wrong, or that petitioner should
 15 be allowed to proceed further. Therefore, the Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

16 Accordingly:

- 17 1. The findings and recommendations issued on July 30, 2024, Doc. 13, are ADOPTED
- 18 in full;
- 19 2. Respondent's motion to dismiss, Doc. 11, is GRANTED;
- 20 3. The petition for writ of habeas corpus, Doc. 6, is DISMISSED;
- 21 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close the case; and
- 22 5. The court declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

23
 24
 25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: October 31, 2024

27 
 28 _____
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE